

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.478 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-351 Year-2025 Thana- BIBHUTIPUR District- Samastipur

1. Tej Narayan Mahto @ Tej Narayan Singh Son of Ram Swaroop Mahto R/o Village - Kodariya, P.S. - Bibhutipur, Dist. - Samastipur, Bihar.
2. Niranjan Kumar Son of Tej Narayn Singh @ Tej Naryan Mahto R/o Village - Kodariya, P.S. - Bibhutipur, Dist. - Samastipur, Bihar.
3. Arun Kumar Singh Son of Late Nandlal Singh @ Nanhku Mahto R/o Village - Kodariya, P.S. - Bibhutipur, Dist. - Samastipur, Bihar.
4. Ram Suddin Singh @ RamSudin Son of Sitaram Singh R/o Village - Kodariya, P.S. - Bibhutipur, Dist. - Samastipur, Bihar.
5. Jitendra Kumar Son of Ram Sudin Singh R/o Village - Kodariya, P.S. - Bibhutipur, Dist. - Samastipur, Bihar.
6. Pankaj Kumar Son of Ramdev Singh @ Ram Dev Mahto R/o Village - Kodariya, P.S. - Bibhutipur, Dist. - Samastipur, Bihar.
7. Rahul Kumar Son of Rampravesh Mahto @ Ram Pravesh Singh R/o Village - Kodariya, P.S. - Bibhutipur, Dist. - Samastipur, Bihar.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Saraswati Devi Kodariya, Samastipur

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Anish Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Ms.Usha Kumari 1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 16-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellants and

learned Spl. P.P. for the State, Ms. Usha Kumari No. 1.

2. This is an appeal under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter referred to as the “SC/ST Act”) against the refusal of prayer for anticipatory bail vide order dated 12-1-2026 in A.B.P. No. 3259 of 2025 passed by the



learned Special Judge S.C./S.T. (POA) Act, Samastipur in connection with Bibhutipur P.S. Case No. 351 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 126(2), 303(2), 115(2), 352, 117(2) and 3(5) of the BNS as well as Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(r)(s)(w) of the SC/ST Act.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellant no. 1 has antecedent of one case and rest of the appellants are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his son was going to chowk via land of Akhilesh when all the accused persons including the appellants intercepted him and abused by taking caste name for using the land of Akhilesh.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that allegation of abuse is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that it does not appear probable that all the accused in one go would have abused the informant by taking caste name.

5. Learned Spl. P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellants.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, let the appellants



above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with the aforesaid case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and the appeal stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

